UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,993	08/03/2006	Patrick Lacroix-Desmazes	279742US0PCT	6577
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			VALENROD	VALENROD, YEVGENY
ALEXANDRI	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	-
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/07/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/553,993	LACROIX-DESMAZES ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Yevgeny Valenrod	1621			
The MAILING Period for Reply	DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHICHEVER IS LON  - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS fron  - If NO period for reply is spe  - Failure to reply within the s  Any reply received by the C	NGER, FROM THE MAILING DA available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 in the mailing date of this communication. ecified above, the maximum statutory period vet or extended period for reply will, by statute,	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH( ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE to date of this communication, even if timely filed	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to	communication(s) filed on 30 Ap	<u>oril 2007</u> .				
2a) This action is F	FINAL. 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)☐ Since this appl	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accor	dance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the abov 5) Claim(s) 6) Claim(s) 7) Claim(s)	is/are rejected.	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
10) The drawing(s)  Applicant may not replacement drawing	ot request that any objection to the awing sheet(s) including the correct	r. epted or b)  objected to by the Education of the Education is required if the drawing(s) is object the Education of the E	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119		·			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cit 2) Notice of Draftsperson's	Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure S Paper No(s)/Mail Date _	Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal P 6) ☐ Other:	atent Application			

# t: 1621

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 17-25, drawn to a process for preparing one or more iodinated organic substances with molecular mass of less than 2000.

Group II, claim(s) 26-33, drawn to mixture comprising at least 2 iodinated organic substances, and also drawn to iodinated substances according to the formulae in the claims.

Group III, claim(s) 34-36, drawn to a process for preparing a polymer by free-radical polymerization.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the technical feature linking together groups I through III is the iodinated organic substance of claim28.

However, the said substance fails to meet the requirements of a special technical feature because it has been disclosed in prior art by Bak et al. (US 5,430,208). Ethyl-3-chloro-3-iodopropionate is described as a catalyst on line 49 of column 5.

# Notice of Potential Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

Art Unit: 1621

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

### Telephone election not made

A telephone call was made to Richard L. Treanor on 1/31/08 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yevgeny Valenrod whose telephone number is 571-272-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/553,993 Art Unit: 1621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000. ()

Yevgeny Valenrod Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

Yvonne Eyler

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600